

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 3, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,293,742 to Gillingham et al. (hereafter referred to as *Gillingham et al.*)

By this reply, Applicants have amended claims 1, 15, and 17 to more appropriately define Applicants' invention. Applicants have also canceled claims 22 and 23 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection with respect to claims 22 and 23 is moot and should be withdrawn. Applicants have also added new claims 24-36. No new matter has been added by this Reply.

Applicants thank the Examiner for speaking with Applicants' representative during the personal interview on August 23, 2005. This response is consistent with the issues discussed during the interview.

Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection with respect to claims 1-14 for at least the reason that *Gillingham et al.* does not disclose every claim element. For example, independent claim 1, from which claims 2-14 ultimately depend, recites a combination of elements including, among other things, a plurality of filters disposed within the housing, wherein each of the plurality of filters includes a plurality of filter sections separated from an adjacent filter section by at least one insulating member. *Gillingham et al.* fails to disclose at least a plurality of filters including a plurality of filter sections separated from an adjacent filter section by at least one insulating member.

Because *Gillingham et al.* does not disclose every claim element of independent claim 1, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) with respect to these claims is improper and should be withdrawn. Furthermore, dependent claims 2-14 are also in condition for allowance at least by virtue of their dependence from independent claim 1.

Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection with respect to claims 15 and 16 for at least the reason that *Gillingham et al.* does not disclose every claim element. For example, independent claim 15, from which claim 16 depends, recites a combination including, among other things, selectively applying electrical current to at least one of a plurality of filter sections of the at least one filter to separately regenerate the at least one filter section, each of the plurality of filter sections being separated from an adjacent filter section by an insulating member. *Gillingham et al.* fails to disclose at least a plurality of filter sections of the at least one filter to separately regenerate the at least one filter section, each of the plurality of filter sections being separated from an adjacent filter section by an insulating member.

Because *Gillingham et al.* does not disclose every claim element of independent claim 15, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) with respect to these claims is improper and should be withdrawn. Furthermore, dependent claim 16 is also in condition for allowance at least by virtue of its dependence from independent claim 15.

Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection with respect to claims 17-21 for at least the reason that *Gillingham et al.* does not disclose every claim element. For example, independent claim 17, from which claims 18-21 depend, recites a combination of elements including, among other things, a plurality of filters disposed

within the housing, wherein each of the plurality of filters includes a plurality of filter sections separated from an adjacent filter section by at least one insulating member.

Gillingham et al. fails to disclose at least a plurality of filters including a plurality of filter sections separated from an adjacent filter section by at least one insulating member.

Because *Gillingham et al.* does not disclose every claim element of independent claim 17, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) with respect to these claims is improper and should be withdrawn. Furthermore, dependent claims 18-21 are also in condition for allowance at least by virtue of their dependence from independent claim 17.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 24-36 are in condition for allowance for at least the reason that the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose every claim element. For example, independent claim 24, recites a particulate trap comprising, among other things, a plurality of filters disposed within the housing, each of the plurality of filters includes a plurality of filter sections separated from each other by an insulating member, and wherein each of the plurality of filter sections has a substantially corrugated shape. None of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest at least these claim elements. Because the cited references do not disclose or suggest every claim element, independent claim 24 is in condition for allowance. Furthermore, dependent claims 25-36 are also in condition for allowance at least by virtue of their dependence from independent claim 24.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 2, 2005

By: 

Brad C. Rametta
Reg. No. 54,387